



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/653,070

09/03/2003

Shigeyuki Miyamoto

8070-1002

2001

466 7590 01/29/2009

YOUNG & THOMPSON
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

CHONG CRUZ, NADJA N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/29/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/653,070	Applicant(s) MIYAMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner NADJA CHONG CRUZ	Art Unit 3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 October 2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This Final action is in reply to the response filed on 20 October 2008.
2. Claims 8, 19-20 have been amended.
3. Claim 21 has been added.
4. Claims 1-21 are currently pending and has been examined.
5. The rejections of claims 1-21 have been updated to reflect the amendments.

Response to Amendment

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.
7. The objection of the drawings in the previous office action is withdrawn, in response to Applicant's amendments and arguments. The examiner thanks the applicant for correcting this minor flaw.
8. The objection of the specification in the previous office action is withdrawn, in response to Applicant's amendments and arguments. The examiner thanks the applicant for correcting this minor flaw. However, the abstract of the disclosure has more than 150 words, therefore, the objection stands.
9. The rejection of claim 8 under 35 USC § 112, 2nd paragraph is withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendment.
10. The rejection of claims 19-20 under 35 USC § 101 paragraph is withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendment.

Specification

11. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

12. The abstract has more than 150 words. The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

13. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
- The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
14. Claims 1-8 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. As per claim 21, the limitations *from a first display portion of an input device; from a second display portion of said input device, wherein said first display portion of said input device is displayed in close proximity to said second display portion of an input device* are not supported by the original disclosure.
15. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
- The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
16. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

17. As per claim 21 recites the limitation *wherein said first display portion of said input device is displayed in close proximity to said second display portion of an input device*. The term "close proximity" in claim 21 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "close proximity" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. How much close is the first display portion from the second display portion? Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments received on 20 October 2008 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.
19. In particular Applicant argues that the prior art of record, specifically that *Miyamoto does not disclose "a calculation unit that calculates total environmental impact values of said reference system and said targeted system **based on** said information stored in said first information storing unit, said second information storing unit, and said third information storing unit,"* (page 18, first paragraph). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Miyamoto teaches in Figure 4, which it illustrates an Environmental Impact Assessment Section and column 4, lines 9-14, which teaches that "[t]he environmental impact assessment section calculates" (e.g., a calculation unit that calculates total environment impact values), "based on the inter-relationships between the respective processes stored in the data storing section" (e.g., first, second and third information stored in the storing unit), "the total environmental impacts of the product by using the environmental impact values obtained in each process." Miyamoto teaches "an input section which inputs text information relating to contents of each of processes representing the life cycle as a plurality of inter-related processes, information relating to inter-relationships between respective processes, factors for environmental impacts arising in each process, and environmental impact values in the factors for environmental impacts" (Miyamoto, column 2, lines 36-42). Miyamoto teaches an input interface to enter information about product and/or system processes related to environmental issues. Miyamoto does not specifically disclose the limitations

Art Unit: 3623

about information from reference and targeted system, however Kobayashi in Figures 8A, 8B and 9, which they illustrates reference character “S23” “Data input for Bench mark Product” (e.g., targeted system) and “Conventional product” (e.g., reference system) and page 10, ¶ 0152, which teaches that “[r]egarding the aimed elements, the product environmental data of each of a bench mark product (this product may be a product of another competitive company)” (e.g., targeted system) “that is a target product and a self company conventional product” (e.g., reference system) “to be improved is read in from the product environmental information database”. Kobayashi suggests that in order to display a comparison between two options (reference and target) as shown in Figures 27-30, information about the conventional product (e.g., reference) and the bench mark product (e.g., target) are inputted into the product environmental information database). Therefore, it would have been obvious to try, by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, to enter a plurality of inputs from different system and/ or product and incorporate it into the system of Miyamoto since there are a finite number of identified, predictable, potential solutions (e.g., plurality of inputs into a database) to the recognized need (environmental options to choose) and one of ordinary skill in the art could have pursued the known potential solutions with a reasonable expectation of success (environmental impact values).

20. With regards to claim 21, Applicant argues that the prior art of record, specifically that *[t]he prior art of record fails to disclose said first input unit that inputs information about said reference system receives input from a first display portion of an input device; and said second input unit that inputs information about said targeted system receives input from a second display portion of said input device, wherein said first display portion of said input device is displayed in close proximity to said second display portion of an input device* (page 19, first paragraph). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Please see the updated rejection below as necessitated by the amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. Claims 1-2, 6-11 and 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Miyamoto (US 5,768,129) in view of Kobayashi et al (US 2004/0236551 A1) hereinafter "Kobayashi".

Claim 1:

Miyamoto as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *a first input unit that inputs information* (Figure 4, which it illustrates an input section and column 5, lines 43-45, which teaches that "[t]he Input Section 1 receives inputs of information relating to the contents of each process, environmental impact values of each environmental impact factor, and an explanatory data for environmental impact factors." Miyamoto suggests that input section allows the user to input information);
- *a first information storing unit that stores said information inputted by said first input unit* (Figure 4, which it illustrates a Data Storing Section and column 5, lines 45-49, which teaches that "[t]he data storing section 2 stores data other than the explanatory data for the environmental impact factors inputted from the input section 1." Miyamoto suggests that information is stored related to the contents of each of the processes inputted to the input section);
- *a second input unit that inputs information* (Figure 4, which it illustrates an input section and column 5, lines 43-45, which teaches that "[t]he Input Section 1

receives inputs of information relating to the contents of each process, environmental impact values of each environmental impact factor, and an explanatory data for environmental impact factors.” Miyamoto suggests that input section allows the user to input information, it is implicitly disclosed that a system allows to enter more than one input);

- *a second information storing unit that stores said information inputted by said second input unit* (Figure 4, which it illustrates a Data Storing Section and column 5, lines 45-49, which teaches that “[t]he data storing section 2 stores data other than the explanatory data for the environmental impact factors inputted from the input section 1.” Miyamoto suggests that information is stored related to the contents of each of the processes inputted to the input section. It is implicitly disclosed that a system storage allows to store more than one input in different tables in a same database, which is well known in database management system);
- *a third information storing unit that stores information about environmental impact value per unit* (Figure 4, which it illustrates an Environmental Impact Assessment Section and column 5, lines 52-56, which teaches that “[t]he environmental impact assessment section 3 provides the total environmental impact values of the product by adding up the environmental impact values of the respective processes based on the inter-relationships between the respective processes.” Miyamoto suggests that environmental impact values per unit are stored in the Environmental Impact Assessment Section);
- *a calculation unit that calculates total environmental impact values of said reference system and said targeted system based on said information stored in said first information storing unit, said second information storing unit, and said third information storing unit* (Figure 4, which it illustrates an Environmental Impact Assessment Section and column 4, lines 9-14, which teaches that “[t]he

environmental impact assessment section calculates, based on the inter-relationships between the respective processes stored in the data storing section, the total environmental impacts of the product by using the environmental impact values obtained in each process.” Miyamoto suggests that a calculation of the total environmental impacts values are obtained);

- *an output unit that outputs said environmental impact values of said reference system and said targeted system* (Figure 4, which it illustrates a Display Section and column 5, lines 56-58, which teaches that “[t]he display section 4 displays the data inputted at the input section 1 and the calculated total environmental impact values.” Miyamoto suggests that the output is more than one environmental impact values (e.g., for reference and targeted system));

Miyamoto does not specifically disclose the limitations about information from reference and targeted system, however Kobayashi as shown does:

- *about said reference system; about said targeted system* (Figures 8A, 8B and 9, which they illustrates reference character “S23” “Data input for Bench mark Product” (e.g., targeted system) and “Conventional product” (e.g., reference system) and page 10, ¶ 0152, which teaches that “[r]egarding the aimed elements, the product environmental data of each of a bench mark product (this product may be a product of another competitive company)” (e.g., targeted system) “that is a target product and a self company conventional product” (e.g., reference system) “to be improved is read in from the product environmental information database”. Kobayashi suggests that in order to display a comparison between two options (reference and target) as shown in Figures 27-30, information about the conventional product (e.g., reference) and the bench mark product (e.g., target) are inputted into the product environmental information database);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to try, by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, to enter a plurality of inputs from different system and/ or product and incorporate it into the system of Miyamoto since there are a finite number of identified, predictable, potential solutions (e.g., plurality of inputs into a database) to the recognized need (environmental options to choose) and one of ordinary skill in the art could have pursued the known potential solutions with a reasonable expectation of success (environmental impact values).

Claim 2:

.Miyamoto teaches "an input section which inputs text information relating to contents of each of processes representing the life cycle as a plurality of inter-related processes, information relating to inter-relationships between respective processes, factors for environmental impacts arising in each process, and environmental impact values in the factors for environmental impacts" (Miyamoto, column 2, lines 36-42). Miyamoto suggests an input interface to enter information about product and/or system processes related to environmental issues. Miyamoto does not specifically disclose inputs *about consumption of electric power*. However, Kobayashi as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein said first input unit includes a first additional input unit that inputs information about consumption of electric power expended by said reference system, and said second input unit includes a second additions input unit that inputs information about consumption of electric power expended by said targeted system* (Figure 29, which it illustrates a comparison between options B and A which are reference systems comparing them to the bench mark product (e.g., targeted system) "Energy saving/use phase" and page 5, ¶ 0071: which teaches that "the product environmental information database is one in which design evaluation results and material-constituting data of many existing products are collected as a database. As the stored data, there are, for example, "the amount of consumption of the resources", "the amount of consumption of the energy" which Kobayashi

suggests inputs about the amount of consumption of electric power (e.g., energy) expended from conventional product (e.g., reference system) and bench mark product (e.g., targeted system) which they are entered into the product environmental database, therefore, solutions are determined based on the input as shown in Figure 29);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to try, by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, to enter a plurality of inputs from different system and/ or product about consumption of the energy and incorporate it into the system of Miyamoto since there are a finite number of identified, predictable, potential solutions (e.g., plurality of inputs into a database) to the recognized need (environmental options to choose) and one of ordinary skill in the art could have pursued the known potential solutions with a reasonable expectation of success (environmental impact values from consumption of the energy).

Claim 6:

Miyamoto teaches “an input section which inputs text information relating to contents of each of processes representing the life cycle as a plurality of inter-related processes, information relating to inter-relationships between respective processes, factors for environmental impacts arising in each process, and environmental impact values in the factors for environmental impacts” (Miyamoto, column 2, lines 36-42). Miyamoto suggests an input interface to enter information about product and/or system processes related to environmental issues. Miyamoto does not specifically disclose inputs *about consumption of electric power*. However, Kobayashi as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein said first input unit includes a ninth additional input unit that inputs information about network services related to said targeted system, and said second input unit includes a tenth additional input unit that inputs information about network services related to said reference system* (Figure 29, which it illustrates a comparison between options B and A which are reference systems comparing them

to the bench mark product (e.g., targeted system) "Resource saving/disposal phase" and page 5, ¶ 0071: which teaches that "the product environmental information database is one in which design evaluation results and material-constituting data of many existing products are collected as a database. As the stored data, there are, for example, "the amount of consumption of the resources", "the amount of consumption of the energy", "the degree of destruction of the ozone layer", "material-constituting data", etc" which Kobayashi suggests inputs about environmental issues and business specific needs (e.g., network services) from conventional product (e.g., reference system) and bench mark product (e.g., targeted system) which they are entered into the product environmental database, therefore, solutions are determined based on the input as shown in Figure 29);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to try, by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, to enter a plurality of inputs from different system and/ or product about consumption of the energy and incorporate it into the system of Miyamoto since there are a finite number of identified, predictable, potential solutions (e.g., plurality of inputs into a database) to the recognized need (environmental options to choose) and one of ordinary skill in the art could have pursued the known potential solutions with a reasonable expectation of success (environmental impact values from network services).

Claim 7:

Miyamoto as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein said first input unit includes a eleventh additional input unit that inputs information about devices or parts to be disposed of related to said targeted system, and said second input unit includes a twelfth additional input unit that inputs information about devices or parts to be disposed of related to said reference system* (column 2, lines 26-42: which teaches that "an environmental assessment system for assessing impacts to environment during a life cycle of a product from its

production up to its disposal” where Miyamoto suggests that information is entered about devices or parts to be disposed because “an input section which inputs text information relating to contents of each of processes representing the life cycle” (e.g. production to disposal) “as a plurality of inter-related processes”;

Miyamoto does not specifically disclose the limitations about information from reference and targeted system, however Kobayashi as shown does:

- *said reference system; said targeted system* (Figures 8A, 8B and 9, which they illustrates reference character “S23” “Data input for Bench mark Product” (e.g., targeted system) and “Conventional product” (e.g., reference system) and page 10, ¶ 0152, which teaches that “[r]egarding the aimed elements, the product environmental data of each of a bench mark product (this product may be a product of another competitive company)” (e.g., targeted system) “that is a target product and a self company conventional product” (e.g., reference system) “to be improved is read in from the product environmental information database”. Kobayashi suggests that in order to display a comparison between two options (reference and target) as shown in Figures 27-30, information about the conventional product (e.g., reference) and the bench mark product (e.g., target) are inputted into the product environmental information database);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to try, by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, to enter a plurality of inputs from different system and/ or product and incorporate it into the system of Miyamoto since there are a finite number of identified, predictable, potential solutions (e.g., plurality of inputs into a database) to the recognized need (environmental options to choose) and one of ordinary skill in the art could have pursued the known potential solutions with a reasonable expectation of success (environmental impact values).

Claim 8:

Miyamoto teaches "an input section which inputs text information relating to contents of each of processes representing the life cycle as a plurality of inter-related processes, information relating to inter-relationships between respective processes, factors for environmental impacts arising in each process, and environmental impact values in the factors for environmental impacts" (Miyamoto, column 2, lines 36-42). Miyamoto suggests an input interface to enter information about product and/or system processes related to environmental issues. Miyamoto does not specifically disclose inputs *about amount of devices or parts to be reserved*. However, Kobayashi as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein said first input unit includes a thirteenth additional input unit that inputs information about an amount of devices or parts to be reserved related to said targeted system, and said second input unit includes a fourteenth additional input unit that inputs information about the amount of devices or parts to be reserved related to said reference system* (Figure 30, which it illustrates an example of decision-making assisting screen image for product or parts to upgrade, part to reuse (e.g., reserved, not for disposal) for products A, B in comparison with a benchmark product and page 6, ¶ 0072 which teaches the ECP design database includes data regarding the design guidelines and environmental issues, which includes "the maximum use of materials capable of recycle" for upgrade or for reuse. Kobayashi suggests that the amount of devices or parts to be reserved are inputted into the system in order to consider an upgrade or to reuse them);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to try, by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, to enter a plurality of inputs from different system and/or product and incorporate it into the system of Miyamoto since there are a finite number of identified, predictable, potential solutions (e.g., plurality of inputs into a database) to the recognized need (environmental options to choose) and one of ordinary skill in the art could have pursued the

known potential solutions with a reasonable expectation of success (environmental impact values for product or part to be upgraded or reused).

Claim 9:

Miyamoto as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *storing said information about said reference system and said information about said targeted system separately* (Figure 4, which it illustrates a Data Storing Section and column 5, lines 45-49, which teaches that “[t]he data storing section 2 stores data other than the explanatory data for the environmental impact factors inputted from the input section 1.” Miyamoto suggests that information is stored related to the contents of each of the processes inputted to the input section. It is implicitly disclosed that a system storage allows to store more than one input in different tables in a same database, which is well known in database management system);
- *calculating total environmental impact value of said reference system based on said information about said reference system and information about environmental impact value per unit that is previously stored* (Figure 4, which it illustrates an Environmental Impact Assessment Section and column 4, lines 9-14, which teaches that “[t]he environmental impact assessment section calculates, based on the inter-relationships between the respective processes stored in the data storing section, the total environmental impacts of the product by using the environmental impact values obtained in each process.” Miyamoto suggests that a calculation of the total environmental impacts values are obtained);
- *calculating total environmental impact value of said targeted system based on said information about said targeted system and said information about environmental impact value per unit* (Figure 4, which it illustrates an Environmental Impact Assessment Section and column 4, lines 9-14, which teaches that “[t]he environmental impact assessment section calculates, based on the inter-

relationships between the respective processes stored in the data storing section, the total environmental impacts of the product by using the environmental impact values obtained in each process.” Miyamoto suggests that a calculation of the total environmental impacts values are obtained);

Miyamoto does not specifically disclose the limitations about inputting information from reference and targeted system in parallel. However, Miyamoto teaches that Figure 4 illustrates an input section and this “[i]nput Section 1 receives inputs of information relating to the contents of each process, environmental impact values of each environmental impact factor, and an explanatory data for environmental impact factors.”(Miyamoto, column 5, lines 43-45). Miyamoto suggests that input section allows the user to input information, however Kobayashi as shown does:

- *inputting information about said reference system and information about said targeted system in parallel* (Figures 8A, 8B and 9, which they illustrates reference character “S23” “Data input for Bench Mark Product” (e.g., targeted system) and “Conventional product” (e.g., reference system) and page 10, ¶ 0152, which teaches that “[r]egarding the aimed elements, the product environmental data of each of a bench mark product (this product may be a product of another competitive company)” (e.g., targeted system) “that is a target product and a self company conventional product” (e.g., reference system) “to be improved is read in from the product environmental information database”. Kobayashi suggests that in order to display a comparison between two options (reference and target) as shown in Figures 27-30, information about the conventional product (e.g., reference) and the bench mark product (e.g., target) are inputted into the product environmental information database. It is implicitly disclosed that information was entered at the same time in order to obtain a comparison between options as shown in Figures 27-30);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to try, by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, to enter a plurality of inputs from different system and/ or product and incorporate it into the system of Miyamoto since there are a finite number of identified, predictable, potential solutions (e.g., plurality of inputs into a database) to the recognized need (environmental options to choose) and one of ordinary skill in the art could have pursued the known potential solutions with a reasonable expectation of success (environmental impact values).

Claim 10:

Miyamoto as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *further comprising the step of displaying said total environmental impact value of said reference system and said total environmental impact value of said targeted system in parallel at a same time* (Figure 4, which it illustrates a Display Section and column 5, lines 56-58, which teaches that “[t]he display section 4 displays the data inputted at the input section 1 and the calculated total environmental impact values.” Miyamoto suggests that the output is more than one environmental impact values (e.g., for reference and targeted system));

Claim 11

As per **Claim 11**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 2. Accordingly, claim 11 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 2, as described above.

Claim 15

As per **Claim 15**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 6. Accordingly, claim 15 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 6, as described above.

Claim 16

As per **Claim 16**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 7. Accordingly, claim 16 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 7, as described above.

Claim 17

As per **Claim 17**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 8. Accordingly, claim 17 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 8, as described above.

Claim 18

The combination of Miyamoto / Kobayashi teaches the limitations of Claim 9, as explained above.

Furthermore, Kobayashi as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein said information about said reference system and said information about said targeted system respectively include at least two of information selected from information about amount of consumption of electric power, information about amount of consumption of papers, information about movement of people, information about transportation properties, information about network services, information about devices or parts to be disposed of, and information about devices or parts to be reserved* (Figure 29, which it illustrates a comparison between options B and A which are reference systems comparing them to the bench mark product (e.g., targeted system) "Resource saving/disposal phase" , "Energy saving/use phase" etc., and page 5, ¶ 0071: which teaches that "the product environmental information database is one in which design evaluation results and material-constituting data of many existing products are collected as a database. As the stored data, there are, for example, "the amount of consumption of the resources", "the amount of consumption of the energy", "the degree of destruction of the ozone layer", "material-constituting date", etc" which Kobayashi suggests inputs about environmental issues from conventional product (e.g., reference system) and bench mark product (e.g., targeted system) which they are entered into the product environmental database, therefore, solutions are determined based on the input as shown in Figure 29);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to try, by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, to enter a plurality of inputs from different system and/ or product

about consumption of the energy and incorporate it into the system of Miyamoto since there are a finite number of identified, predictable, potential solutions (e.g., plurality of inputs into a database) to the recognized need (environmental options to choose) and one of ordinary skill in the art could have pursued the known potential solutions with a reasonable expectation of success (environmental impact values).

Claim 19:

Miyamoto as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *accepting inputting of information* (Figure 4, which it illustrates an input section and column 5, lines 43-45, which teaches that “[t]he Input Section 1 receives inputs of information relating to the contents of each process, environmental impact values of each environmental impact factor, and an explanatory data for environmental impact factors.” Miyamoto suggests that input section allows the user to input information);
- *storing said information* (Figure 4, which it illustrates a Data Storing Section and column 5, lines 45-49, which teaches that “[t]he data storing section 2 stores data other than the explanatory data for the environmental impact factors inputted from the input section 1.” Miyamoto suggests that information is stored related to the contents of each of the processes inputted to the input section);
- *obtaining information about environmental impact value per unit* (Figure 4, which it illustrates an Environmental Impact Assessment Section and column 5, lines 52-56, which teaches that “[t]he environmental impact assessment section 3 provides the total environmental impact values of the product by adding up the environmental impact values of the respective processes based on the inter-relationships between the respective processes.” Miyamoto suggests that environmental impact values per unit are stored in the Environmental Impact Assessment Section);

- *calculating total environmental impact value of said reference system based on said information about said reference system and said information about environmental impact value per unit* (Figure 4, which it illustrates an Environmental Impact Assessment Section and column 4, lines 9-14, which teaches that “[t]he environmental impact assessment section calculates, based on the inter-relationships between the respective processes stored in the data storing section, the total environmental impacts of the product by using the environmental impact values obtained in each process.” Miyamoto suggests that a calculation of the total environmental impacts values are obtained);
- *calculating total environmental impact value of said targeted system based on said information about said targeted system and said information about environmental impact value per unit* (Figure 4, which it illustrates an Environmental Impact Assessment Section and column 4, lines 9-14, which teaches that “[t]he environmental impact assessment section calculates, based on the inter-relationships between the respective processes stored in the data storing section, the total environmental impacts of the product by using the environmental impact values obtained in each process.” Miyamoto suggests that a calculation of the total environmental impacts values are obtained);

Miyamoto does not specifically disclose the limitations about information from reference and targeted system, however Kobayashi as shown does:

- *about said reference system; about said targeted system* (Figures 8A, 8B and 9, which they illustrates reference character “S23” “Data input for Bench mark Product” (e.g., targeted system) and “Conventional product” (e.g., reference system) and page 10, ¶ 0152, which teaches that “[r]egarding the aimed elements, the product environmental data of each of a bench mark product (this product may be a product of another competitive company)” (e.g., targeted system) “that is a

target product and a self company conventional product” (e.g., reference system) “to be improved is read in from the product environmental information database”. Kobayashi suggests that in order to display a comparison between two options (reference and target) as shown in Figures 27-30, information about the conventional product (e.g., reference) and the bench mark product (e.g., target) are inputted into the product environmental information database);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to try, by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, to enter a plurality of inputs from different system and/ or product and incorporate it into the system of Miyamoto since there are a finite number of identified, predictable, potential solutions (e.g., plurality of inputs into a database) to the recognized need (environmental options to choose) and one of ordinary skill in the art could have pursued the known potential solutions with a reasonable expectation of success (environmental impact values).

Claim 20

As per **Claim 20**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 10. Accordingly, claim 20 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 10, as described above.

Claim 21:

Miyamoto as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein said first input unit that inputs information and said second input unit that inputs information* (Figure 4, which it illustrates an input section and column 5, lines 43-45, which teaches that “[t]he Input Section 1 receives inputs of information relating to the contents of each process, environmental impact values of each environmental impact factor, and an explanatory data for environmental impact factors.” Miyamoto suggests that input section allows the user to input information, it is implicitly disclosed that a system allows to enter more than one input);

Further, Miyamoto teaches that “an input section which inputs text information relating to contents of each of processes representing the life cycle as a plurality of inter-related processes, information relating to inter-relationships between respective processes, factors for environmental impacts arising in each process, and environmental impact values in the factors for environmental impacts” (Miyamoto, column 2, lines 36-42). Miyamoto teaches an input interface to enter information about product and/or system processes related to environmental issues.

Miyamoto does not specifically disclose the limitations about how the information of a reference and targeted system is inputted in an input device as described below, however Kobayashi in an analogous art assessing environmental impacts, as shown does:

- *about said reference system; about said targeted system* (Figures 8A, 8B and 9, which they illustrates reference character “S23” “Data input for Bench mark Product” (e.g., targeted system) and “Conventional product” (e.g., reference system) and page 10, ¶ 0152, which teaches that “[r]egarding the aimed elements, the product environmental data of each of a bench mark product (this product may be a product of another competitive company)” (e.g., targeted system) “that is a target product and a self company conventional product” (e.g., reference system) “to be improved is read in from the product environmental information database”. Kobayashi suggests that in order to display a comparison between two options (reference and target) as shown in Figures 27-30, information about the conventional product (e.g., reference) and the bench mark product (e.g., target) are inputted into the product environmental information database);
- *receives input from a first display portion of an input device* (Figure 23, which it illustrates that receives input "Design Guideline 1, Design Guideline 2, Design Guideline 3" from a first display portion "For ENV Issues" of an input device "Figure 3: Input Device 13");

- *receives input from a second display portion of said input device* (Figure 23, which it illustrates that receives input "Design Guideline 1, Design Guideline 2, Design Guideline 3" from a second display portion "For EOL Issues" of an input device "Figure 3: Input Device 13");
- *wherein said first display portion of said input device is displayed in close proximity to said second display portion of an input device* (Figure 23, which it illustrates that the first display portion is displayed in close proximity with the second display portion, "For ENV Issues" display portion is above of "For EOL Issues" display portion);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to try, by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, to enter a plurality of inputs from different system and/ or product and incorporate it into the system of Miyamoto since there are a finite number of identified, predictable, potential solutions (e.g., plurality of inputs into a database) to the recognized need (environmental options to choose) and one of ordinary skill in the art could have pursued the known potential solutions with a reasonable expectation of success (environmental impact values).

- 23.** Claims 3-5 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Miyamoto / Kobayashi as applied to claims 1-2, 6-11 and 15-21 above in view of Sakurai et al (US 2002/0035550 A1) hereinafter "Sakurai".

Claim 3:

Miyamoto teaches "an input section which inputs text information relating to contents of each of processes representing the life cycle as a plurality of inter-related processes, information relating to inter-relationships between respective processes, factors for environmental impacts arising in each process, and environmental impact values in the factors for environmental impacts" (Miyamoto, column 2, lines 36-42). Miyamoto suggests an input interface to enter information about product and/or system processes related to environmental issues.

In addition, Kobayashi teaches that Figure 29, which it illustrates a comparison between options B and A which are reference systems comparing them to the bench mark product (e.g., targeted system) "Resource Saving/Disposal Phase" which shows different options and page 5, ¶ 0071, "the product environmental information database is one in which design evaluation results and material-constituting data of many existing products are collected as a database. As the stored data, there are, for example, "the amount of consumption of the resources" (e.g., consumption of papers) "etc.", which Kobayashi suggests inputs about consumption of resources from conventional product (e.g., reference system) and bench mark product (e.g., targeted system) which they are entered into the product environmental database. The combination of Miyamoto / Kobayashi does not specifically disclose inputs *about consumption of papers expended*. However, Sakurai as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein said first input unit includes a third additional input unit that inputs information about consumption of papers expended by said reference system, and said second input unit includes a fourth additional input unit that inputs information about consumption of papers expended by said targeted system* (page 10, ¶ 0176: which teaches that "the maintenance-information system 33 manages information representing the consumption of power, the consumption of utilized water resources, the consumption of paper resources" where Sakurai suggests inputs information about consumption of papers expended are stored in a database);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system for assessing impact on environment during life cycle of product of Miyamoto with the computer-aided designing assistant apparatus and method of assisting designing of environmentally conscious product as taught by Kobayashi and the system and method for providing environmental management information of Sakurai because it provides "environmental management information, for efficiently minimizing environmental impacts and facilitating activities for gaining the economical benefit." (Sakurai, page 1, ¶ 0009). Furthermore, Sakurai teaches that facilitate "the appropriate decision making on the management regarding

environmental matters, thereby contributing to a reduction in the environmental impacts.”
(Sakurai, page 1, ¶ 0010);

Claim 4:

Miyamoto teaches “an input section which inputs text information relating to contents of each of processes representing the life cycle as a plurality of inter-related processes, information relating to inter-relationships between respective processes, factors for environmental impacts arising in each process, and environmental impact values in the factors for environmental impacts” (Miyamoto, column 2, lines 36-42). Miyamoto suggests an input interface to enter information about product and/or system processes related to environmental issues.

In addition, Kobayashi teaches that Figure 29, which it illustrates a comparison between options B and A which are reference systems comparing them to the bench mark product (e.g., targeted system) “Waste Reduction/Distribution Phase” which shows different options and page 5, ¶ 0071 “the product environmental information database is one in which design evaluation results and material-constituting data of many existing products are collected as a database. As the stored data, there are, for example, “the amount of consumption of the resources” (e.g., movement of people including time availability and distance) “etc.”, which Kobayashi suggests inputs about consumption of resources from conventional product (e.g., reference system) and bench mark product (e.g., targeted system) which they are entered into the product environmental database. The combination of Miyamoto / Kobayashi does not specifically disclose inputs *about consumption of papers expensed*. However, Sakurai as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein said first input unit includes a fifth additional input unit that inputs information about movement of people related to said targeted system, and said second input unit includes a sixth additional input unit that inputs information about movement of people related to said reference system* (page 12, ¶ 0219: which teaches that “[t]he maintenance information system 33 obtains the proportion of the number of times the maintenance process is performed for each type of product to the total number of times the maintenance process is performed (the total number

of times the staff have visited the customers' to perform the maintenance process). The maintenance information system 33 multiplies thus obtained proportion to the value of the entire environmental impact at the maintenance process, thereby deriving the environmental impact at the maintenance process, according to each type of product. Further, the maintenance information system 33 collects the usage context of fossil fuel and chemical materials at points where the maintenance process is performed" which Sakurai suggests that when the staff visit the customer there is a movement of people, in addition the maintenance system store that information with the usage of fossil fuel (e.g., vehicle transportation));

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system for assessing impact on environment during life cycle of product of Miyamoto with the computer-aided designing assistant apparatus and method of assisting designing of environmentally conscious product as taught by Kobayashi and the system and method for providing environmental management information of Sakurai because it provides "environmental management information, for efficiently minimizing environmental impacts and facilitating activities for gaining the economical benefit." (Sakurai, page 1, ¶ 0009). Furthermore, Sakurai teaches that facilitate "the appropriate decision making on the management regarding environmental matters, thereby contributing to a reduction in the environmental impacts." (Sakurai, page 1, ¶ 0010);

Claim 5:

Miyamoto teaches "an input section which inputs text information relating to contents of each of processes representing the life cycle as a plurality of inter-related processes, information relating to inter-relationships between respective processes, factors for environmental impacts arising in each process, and environmental impact values in the factors for environmental impacts" (Miyamoto, column 2, lines 36-42). Miyamoto suggests an input interface to enter information about product and/or system processes related to environmental issues.

In addition, Kobayashi teaches that Figure 29, which it illustrates a comparison between options B and A which are reference systems comparing them to the bench mark product (e.g., targeted system) "Waste Reduction/Distribution Phase" which shows different options and page 5, ¶ 0071 "the product environmental information database is one in which design evaluation results and material-constituting data of many existing products are collected as a database. As the stored data, there are, for example, "the amount of consumption of the resources" (e.g., transportation properties) "etc.", which Kobayashi suggests inputs about consumption of resources from conventional product (e.g., reference system) and bench mark product (e.g., targeted system) which they are entered into the product environmental database. The combination of Miyamoto / Kobayashi does not specifically disclose inputs *about consumption of papers expended*. However, Sakurai as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *wherein said first input unit includes a seventh additional input unit that inputs information about transportation properties related to said targeted system, and said second input unit includes a eighth additional input unit that inputs information about 20 transportation properties related to said reference system (page 12, ¶ 0214 and page 13, ¶ 0219: which teaches that "the distribution/sales information system 29 collects information representing the environmental impact at the time of transporting products" (e.g., transportation properties) "and information representing the environmental impact at points where products are distributed and sold". Furthermore, Sakurai teaches that "the environmental impact to be directly generated at the time of distribution process is generated when the products are transported" where Sakurai suggests that inputs about transportation properties are entered, because "the environmental-impact information collection system 39 divides the obtained value of the environmental impact by each weight of product, thereby deriving the environmental impact at the time of transporting each type of products.);*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system for assessing impact on environment during life cycle of product of Miyamoto with the computer-aided designing assistant apparatus and method of assisting designing of environmentally conscious product as taught by Kobayashi and the system and method for providing environmental management information of Sakurai because it provides “environmental management information, for efficiently minimizing environmental impacts and facilitating activities for gaining the economical benefit.” (Sakurai, page 1, ¶ 0009). Furthermore, Sakurai teaches that facilitate “the appropriate decision making on the management regarding environmental matters, thereby contributing to a reduction in the environmental impacts.” (Sakurai, page 1, ¶ 0010);

Claim 12

As per **Claim 12**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 3. Accordingly, claim 12 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 3, as described above.

Claim 13

As per **Claim 13**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 4. Accordingly, claim 13 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 4, as described above.

Claim 14

As per **Claim 14**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 5. Accordingly, claim 14 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 5, as described above..

Conclusion

- 24.** The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- http://sapdesignguild.org/resources/htmlb_guidance/inputfield.html, Input Field, 2002, which disclose that Input fields are used for entering and displaying data in forms.

25. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **Nadja Chong** whose telephone number is **570.270.3939**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **BETH BOSWEL** can be reached at **571.272.6737**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair> <<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to **571-273-8300**.

Art Unit: 3623

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the **United States Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window:**

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314.

/Nadja Chong/

Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Beth V. Boswell/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623